

MAY 20 2003



5-21-03

ATF/2881
PATENT #9 1/2

6/16/03
RECEIVED
MAY 22 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: Ralph E. Bucknam

SERIAL NO.: 10/066,847

EXAMINER: NIKITA WELLS

FILED; FEBRUARY 4, 2002

GROUP: 2881

TITLE: ENERGY FINDING TECHNIQUE AND TYPICAL USEFUL
DEVICE

CASE: BA 22810

REPLY TO FINAL OFFICIAL ACTION

The Examiner's Final Action is *completely non-responsive*. This is like trying to play tennis with an opponent who has a hole in his racket!

In arbitrarily ruling that the "invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility" the Examiner is conveniently completely ignoring Fig. 3 which shows *in very precise detail* how to construct a lodestone magnetic device capable of operating a tiny toy vehicle. Figs. 14 A and B show exactly how lodestone replaces a battery. Does the Examiner *really* expect Applicant to submit a model simply to satisfy him?

The Patent Office's delinquent and imprudent handling of this Application since it was filed shows conclusively that it is dead set against having uncontroversial mathematical proof published showing beyond any room for argument that $E=mc^2$ is fatally flawed. It is *most* unbecoming not only of the Examiner but of the United States Patent Office whom he represents to brush off the *vitally important* disclosure of this far-reaching defect with the snide, evasive words "disenchantment with Einstein's equation"!

Look around at the enormous damage anomalies in the Earth's nuclear binding energy as seen for example in earthquakes and tornadoes does and ask yourself how can this delinquent action be justified!

To get straight to the *fundamental* point, (identifying enclosures with capital letters) the enclosed page 995 (letter A) from year 2000 CHEMISTRY by Brady-Russell-Holum, which I sent you explains Einstein's misconception "mass defect". : "... the mass defect represents mass that changes into energy as the neutrons gather to form the nucleus, this energy being released from the system". As the textbook explains, the allegedly lost binding energy in the case of 4 g helium could keep a 100 watt lightbulb lit for nearly 900 years !

On enclosure B, page 19 of the Kolmogorov pamphlet I sent you, I pinpointed Einstein's ridiculous contention in his Special Theory of Relativity that, if an electron could achieve the speed of light in a vacuum, it would have *infinite* energy. This is called "catastrophic" mathematics. It is the same fault which led Max Planck to develop Quantum Mechanics.

To help understand the Einstein defect I included Figs. 1, 2A and 2B in the patent drawings. The Examiner has simply ignored this disclosure.

Enclosure C, also previously sent to you, is page 914 of Chang's CHEMISTRY (2002) which also explains in detail the misguided Einstein "mass defect" concept.

The Examiner who quite obviously is an expert only in the very narrow electromagnetic segment covered by Art Group 2881 of the Patent Office has asked Applicant to explain "How is the inherent potential energy trapped in the lodestones transformed into useful mechanical energy?". To be sure, if Applicant understands the question, I would also be very curious to learn more about what happens when nuclear binding energy is released in a substance which takes on the properties of lodestone, for example.

The most satisfactory explanation Applicant has found is in enclosures D and E from VAN NOSTRAN'S SCIENTIFIC ENCYCLOPEDIA (3rd Ed .) 1958. Enclosure D, page 1013, as part of the definition of Magnetite (lodestone) states " It is believed to have been formed by a segregation in the Magma". At page 1004, enclosure E, we learn that:

"The locus of a Magma is within the *lithosphere* (crust) under great pressure an impenetrable cover which helps the magma to retain its original gases and water vapor in solution. The origin of magma is not known but it is generally assumed that separate magma chambers may exist within the lithosphere.

Applicant believes the generally accepted explanation for magnetic polarity is an imbalance of opposing magnetized ions where the imbalance manifests itself as a polarized magnetic field.

In terms of the plan now being advanced in the U. S. Energy Department to set up a pilot plant at Palmdale, CA claim 1, for example, applies as follows:

"A method of generating useful energy" (operating the proposed pilot plant, which can be regarded either as a 'device' or as a 'system') ... "which comprises"

"Mounting such substance in or on a device adapted to operate over a predetermined time to extract such energy," (The pilot plant as a device or system , includes a shaft drilled into an active part of the Earth as the isolated 'substance', so by scientific positioning , this chosen Earth substance yielding freed nuclear binding energy is encompassed "in" the confines of the pilot plant as a whole,)

and the pilot plant is "adapted over a predetermined time to extract such energy" (and yield fresh water).

"Conditioning a storage device to receive such extracted energy" (A storage dam is provided for this energy in the form of fresh water),

"and applying the stored energy for useful purposes" (using the stored water for such uses as generating electricity and irrigating fields).



Some time ago the Patent Office was provided with a copy of my brief as submitted to the Supreme Court requesting Certiorari in regard to Appln. No. 316,471. As can be seen, I learned a real lesson. Rather than coming to grips with the mathematical problem involved therein, the Examiner passed the problem to the Board of Appeals on the expectation that they would go into the mathematical question thoroughly and with understanding. The Hearing before the Patent Appeal Board lasted about an hour and consisted mainly of banter about mathematics in general. Rehearing was refused.

Only one of the three judges in the Circuit Court of Appeals showed any understanding and interest at all. In rendering a decision the Court failed to comply with the 35 U.S.C. 144 requirement that, in patent cases, it must render an opinion. Naturally, the Supreme Court refused certiorari.

It is understandable that I am unwilling to expose myself to another such frustrating and expensive endeavor. Enclosed is copy of a letter I have just written to the program manager of the U. S. Energy Department. Can't you find a way to help?

Respectfully submitted,


Ralph E. Bucknam
Ralph E. Bucknam, Reg. No. 14814

BUCKNAM AND ARCHER
Attorney for Applicant
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(631) 427-9322
(516) 365-9802

"EXPRESS MAIL" no. ER225861029US

Date of Deposit: May 20, 2003

I hereby certify that this paper of fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10, on the date indicated above, and is addressed to Mail Stop, Commissioner of Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.


Ralph E. Bucknam